

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-31 and 33-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-9, 19, 21-28, 30 and 36-40 stand withdrawn. By this Amendment, claims 10, 12, 13, 29, 31 and 33-35 are amended and claims 41-45 are canceled. Support for the amended claims can be found, at least, at Fig. 4 and page 22, line 8 to page 27, line 24 of the original specification. No new matter is added.

Claims 10, 12-18, 29, 31, 33-35 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 41-45 have been canceled rendering the rejection moot. Claims 10, 12, 13, 29, 31 and 33-35 have been amended to obviate the rejection. For example, the claims no longer recite the "minimized" feature and claims 29 and 31 clarify a "set" of holograms each having a plurality of pages. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10, 12, 13, 29, 31 and 33-35, and claims 14-18 depending therefrom, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claims 10, 12-18, 29, 31, 33-35 and 41-45 for informalities. Claims 41-45 have been canceled rendering the objection moot. Claims 10, 12, 13, 29, 31 and 33-35 have been amended for further clarity. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection of claims 10, 12, 13, 29, 31 and 33-35, and claims 14-18 depending therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 14, 29, 31, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,301,028 to Tanaka et al. ("Tanaka"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 41 and 42 have been canceled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 10, as amended, now recites "recording a first hologram...shifting a recording start position of a second hologram from the recording start position of the first hologram by substantially half of the predetermined interval, and recording...the second hologram in the

substantially same region...at the substantially same predetermined interval" (emphasis added). This is shown, for example, in Applicants' Figs. 4 and 7B. Likewise, claims 29 and 31 recite substantially the same features.

Applicants respectfully assert that Tanaka does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 10, 29 and 31 as amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10, 29 and 31, and claims depending therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 29, 31 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,721,076 to King et al. ("King"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 41-45 have been canceled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

As discussed above, claims 10, 29 and 31 as amended, now recite additional features. Applicants respectfully assert that King does not disclose each and every feature of claims 10, 29 and 31 as amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10, 29 and 31 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 13 and 33-35 are alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tanaka or King in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,890 to Kawano et al. ("Kawano"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 12, 13 and 33-35 depend from claims 10, 29 and 31, respectively. As discussed above, Tanaka and King fail to disclose the subject matter of these independent claims. Furthermore, Kawano fails to disclose the deficient subject matter. As such, King, Tanaka and Kawano fail to disclose or suggest the features of claims 12, 13 and 33-35. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12, 13 and 33-35 is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-18 are alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tanaka or King in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,129,006 to Hesselink et al. ("Hesselink"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 15-18 depend from claims 10. As discussed above, Tanaka and King fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 10. Furthermore, Hesselink fails to disclose the deficient subject matter. As such, King, Tanaka and Hesselink fail to disclose or suggest the features of claims 15-18. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-18 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 29, 31, 41 and 42 are provisionally rejected for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 7,218,597. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 41 and 42 have been canceled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

As discussed above, claims 10, 29 and 31 as amended, now recite additional features. These features are not present, nor suggested, by claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 7,218,597. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10, 29 and 31 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Moshe K. Wilensky
Registration No. 56,263

JAO:MKW/jth

Date: August 11, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
